



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 04 April 2023

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/D/23/3315572

4 Hill Rise, Trowell, Nottinghamshire NG9 3PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Travis Perkins against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/00844/FUL, dated 28 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 03 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion with side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a predominately residential area, on the eastern side of Hill Rise. No 4 Hill Rise is a two storey, gable fronted, detached dwelling within a row of four similarly designed properties on this side of the carriageway. These dwellings are consistent in terms of their simple design, maximum ridge height, eaves height and angle of roof pitch. Consequently, while there are a variety of architectural compositions in the area, this particular part of the streetscene has a distinct sense of rhythm and uniformity. This is reinforced by unaltered roofscapes, which is also a prevailing characteristic of the wider area.
4. The proposal seeks permission to raise the roof of No 4 to accommodate a loft conversion. Sloped dormer windows would be constructed on either side of the roof to facilitate this. While dormers could be clad in materials similar to the appearance of the existing roof tiles, they would be positioned close to the roof ridge height, eaves level and front and rear elevations. As such, dormers would occupy almost the entirety of the roofscape. They would therefore be overly large, dominant, additions to No 4 that would significantly erode its simple design.
5. Moreover, the dormers would introduce alien and conspicuous features to this streetscene, disrupting its rhythm and uniformity. This would be reinforced given that the proposal would result in No 4 exceeding the height of adjacent

dwellings with a notably sharper roof pitch. The proposal's harmful impact would be readily apparent from the public domain. This would not be mitigated by the sloping roofs of dormer windows, which would awkwardly jar with the steeper main roof pitch.

6. My attention has been drawn to a flat roofed dormer window at No 20 Hill Rise. However, this appears to have been installed without raising the overall ridge height of the host property and occupies only one side of the roof slope. It is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which has been assessed on its own individual merits. In any event, this is not a reason to permit a proposal that would inappropriately draw the eye in a streetscene mainly characterised by undeveloped roofscapes.
7. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property, and that of the wider area. Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with Policy 10 of the Broxtowe Aligned Core Strategy (2014), and Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan (2019). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development, including dormer windows, does not dominate buildings and roofscapes and contributes positively to the character of the area.

Other Matters

8. I sympathise with the appellant's aspirations to extend the property in an affordable manner to accommodate for a growing family. Indeed, the development plan seeks to provide larger family homes. Nevertheless, it is likely that these benefits to the appellant would be short term when compared to the permanent harm to the host building and streetscene. This is therefore not a significant factor in my overall assessment.
9. It is suggested that large, flat roofed, dormer windows could be constructed under the provisions of the permitted development regulations. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to show exactly what could be achieved under these regulations. Consequently, a comparison with the appeal proposal cannot be made. In any event, I have considered this scheme on its individual merits, in the light of the relevant development plan policies.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the development conflicts with the Development Plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations which outweigh the harm identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR